DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 667 HE 018 662

AUTHOR Pittman-Munke, Peggy
TITLE Part Time Alternative Program, Graduate Social Work Education in Texas: Nibblers at the Feast of Learning.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Advising; Academic Rank (Professional); College Admission; College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Experiential Learning; *Extension Education; Grading; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Masters Degrees; Off Campus Facilities; *Part Time Students; Residence Requirements; School Schedules; *Social Work
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

A study was made of the way part-time students are served by the four graduate schools of social work in Texas: University of Texas in Austin (UT), University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), University of Houston, and the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake University (OLLU). Each school offers at least one type of part-time program, but while the University of Houston has only the part-time, on-campus model, each of the other three schools has satellite model programs also. Both UT and UTA utilize other colleges as their off-campus instructional sites, and OLLU utilizes training facilities. The number of students admitted each year ranges from a low of about 15 students (OLLU) to a high of about 30 students at UT's off-site program. All three schools have the same admissions criteria for both programs. However, both OLLU and UTA require a period of residence on the main campus that ranges from 15 weeks at OLLU to 32 weeks for UTA students. The UT program is completely off-site, with no Austin residence requirements. Information was also obtained on: the academic rank of faculty involved in off-site, part-time master's of social work programs; academic advising for students; course sequencing by semester; field placements; and grading systems. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED260667

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART TIME ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM GRADUATE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION IN TEXAS: Nibblers at the Feast of Learning

Peggy Pittman-Munke, M.Ed, MLS, MSW, PhD
Dept. of Sociology and Social Work
Concordia College
Moorhead, Minn. 56560

HE018662

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peggy Pittman-Munke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Part-time education on the post-secondary level has existed since before the turn of the century, particularly in professional schools such as law, medicine, and social work. However, the literature does not reflect this, and the model chosen by the American educational community was that of the traditional full-time student for whom attending college or professional school was his/her life work.

However, in the mid-1970s, the part-time undergraduate student began to achieve at least a modicum of attention from sectors of the post-secondary educational world other than the community college. Some of this push to serve the part-time, nontraditional student on the part of the educational establishment was the result of the woman's movement, the War on Poverty, and the pressure from the federal government to bring minority group members into partnership with the more affluent (Carneige Commission, 1983). Further, this federal drive to open college attendance to minority groups and women as well as the push towards affirmative action, which also impacted women and minority groups, probably also influenced the formal opening of college and post-graduate admissions to the part-time student, and forced some recognition of this student's special life situation and unique needs. Additionally, the proliferation of colleges and universities during the 1960s and 1970s and the need of these institutions for students may have been instrumental in drawing the administration's attention to the part-time student as a relatively profitable market to be tapped. Other factors affecting the acceptance of the part-time student role were the higher cost of tuition and declining federal support

for traineeships.

Cross (1975, p. 58) pointed out that by 1972 "the number of part-time students began to exceed the number of full-time students in institutions of higher education." By 1978, the growing impact of Reaganomics signalled that federal dollars would no longer be freely available for the needs of higher education. The part-time student thus became a vital component of the educational marketplace. In spite of this fact, there is a dearth of material specifically devoted to the part-time student, especially the graduate or professional school part-time student. Graduate social work education follows this trend, barely admitting the existence of the part-time graduate student.

PART-TIME GRADUATE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Part-time social work education is often represented as a fairly recent entry into the field of social work education. Boynton (1981, p. 60) states:

> Our awareness of the emerging change in Social Work Education has come slowly. In fact, some universities have only recently begun to provide services to a "new" type of student.

Bragg (1981) presents a plausible rationale for Boynton's statement:

> In our era when graduate school enrollments are dropping and competition for students within the helping profession is heating up, graduate social work education has remained an anachronism.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Establishing programs for part-time students would appear to be the answer to several . . . problems. In a time of shrinking enrollments, this may be the most effective way of reaching new groups of potential students. (p. 8)

Historical Foundations

However, the roots of part-time education on the graduate level are woven deep into the professional history of social work. The prestigious New York School of Social Work, now the Columbia University School of Social Work, has a long history of service to part-time students.

Meier (1950) stated that when the School of Philanthropy (an early name for the New York School of Social Work) opened in the fall of 1904, a program of part-time courses in the winter months had already been in operation for two years. These part-time students, who numbered about 150 per year, met once or twice a week between October and April and came from New York City. Each winter school session included about 40 lectures and some agency visits and observational trips. This course of study was intended to serve the needs of three classes of persons:

> (1) those who are professionally engaged in work for charitable societies, and agencies for social uplift, and who desire to know more about the sources of aid they are required to use, (2) those who are employed as helpers in institutions, and wish broader knowledge of ideals and methods, (3) the 'charitable laity' who are actively supporting with money and personal service, such societies, agencies and institutions, and desire to know how they can help most wisely. (Meier, 1950, p. 18)

The New York School continued to grow, and part-time students also continued to seek admission. It was thought necessary to place some restriction on the enrollment of part-time students in order to strengthen the program for full-time students, because the discussion method of teaching then used required that the class size be limited. By 1932, part-time students were permitted to enroll only in certain designated

sections of some courses.

> Nevertheless, the School felt a responsibility to provide opportunities for partial training; in 1929, 859 students enrolled for individual courses, and in 1938, there were 1,086 such students. (Meier, 1950, p.81)

It seems clear that part-time students in relatively large numbers were a part of the history of the New York School.

The school established by the Chicago Commons which became a part of the University of Chicago in 1920 similarly educated part-time social workers in its early years. However, Julia Lathrop and Edith Abbott ended the school's connection with part-time graduate education when they assumed the reins of the school in 1920 (Taylor, 1936). Thus, part-time graduate social work education figured in the history of two very prominent schools, among others. In the early days, the enrollment of the part-time student was encouraged to serve the need of the profession, that is, the need for trained workers, without losing workers to graduate study when they could not be spared from their professional duties.

The statistics on social work education which were published in the Social Service Review, beginning with the 1934-35 school year, and later by the Council on Social Work Education beginning in 1954, also reflected consistently a good percentage of part-time students. The number ebbed and flowed with the needs of the profession for workers, but was always a factor in the education of social workers.

Recent Developments

A major impetus to the development of formal programs designed for the needs of part-time students came about in the 1970s. During this decade, the need of rural areas for

professional social workers was recognized, and paraprofessionals were encouraged to gain professional standing. Some of this incentive was generated by social justice issues raised during the preceding decade, but the burgeoning federal deficit and "Reagonomics" also provided their own special incentive. Much of the federal money previously allocated to the education of social workers ceased to flow by the end of the 1970s; shifting federal priorities favored competing disciplines, engineering, computer science, business, journalism, and law, and the defense establishment.

Many schools of social work had expanded during the late 1960s and early 1970s and new programs had been accredited to meet the needs of both social work students with federal traineeships, and underserved areas, including child welfare, community mental health, and rural areas. Although by the end of the 1970s, the federal traineeships had for the most part ceased to exist, an even greater proportion of the population was underserved by the social work community as a result of widespread unemployment and its attendant conditions in some areas of the country. Many graduate schools of social work rose to the challenge and either broadened existing programs or established new programs to meet both the needs of working students and their own need for survival.

The Case of Texas

By the late 1970s and the early 1980s, Texas, like the rest of the nation, had problems with an underserved population in many parts of the state. The problems of the state were exacerbated by a large population of disadvantaged Mexican-

Americans, a red-neck dominated legislature, unemployment in the formerly booming oil-dependent East Texas area, economic pressures on the Texas-Mexico border stemming from Mexico's internal problems, and a huge influx of unskilled workers from other parts of the country. Added to these circumstances was the poverty of the huge rural areas (Caro, 1983).

The situation in the state was such that the graduate schools in Texas were open to the resurgence of part-time students in social work education. Texas, roughly analogous in area to New England plus the Middle Atlantic states (Caro, 1983), housed only four graduate schools of social work within the state. These were the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake University, dating from the early 1940s; the School of Social Work at the University of Texas in Austin, established in the early 1950s, the oldest and most prestigious of the state schools; the school at the University of Houston, serving East Texas; and finally, the School at the University of Texas at Arlington, a suburb of Dallas/Fort Worth, serving the north central portion of the state. Compared to the Northeast and Middle Atlantic portion of the United States, a great deal of the state was still unserved, including the border areas and most of the rural counties. Thus, the need for innovative programming was very great, for many human service employees were unable to attend full-time for personal and financial reasons, and because they simply could not be spared from their professional duties. In order to determine the pattern of part-time graduate social work educational programs in Texas, the deans of the four schools (or their designated representatives) were surveyed.

National Models and Issues

Program models in Texas were presumed to be little different than those available nationally. Leuenberger et al (1983) identified three general program models in use nationally to serve part-time students. These are:

1. the permanent "satellite model" in which course instruction is provided at specific and permanent off campus locations;
2. the transient "satellite model" in which the school of social work does not maintain a permanent off campus learning site; and
3. a part-time on-campus program in which students attend classes during evening hours or on weekends.

Another model, not discussed by Leuenberger et al (1983), would allow part-time students to participate in regular classes with full-time students.

Issues facing the Texas programs and models of part-time education were assumed to be little different than those facing other programs nationally. Leuenberger et al (1983) identify admissions requirements as a frequently expressed source of concern; and faculty deployment, course content, field placement, socialization and educational resources as potential problems in the establishment of part-time programs. Thus, Leuenberger questionnaire which addressed these areas specifically was administered to the designated respondents in each of the four Texas graduate schools of social work.

METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire was mailed to the four deans of graduate schools of social work in Texas. They were asked

to complete the questionnaire or to route it to the person in charge of the part-time program. They were advised that a follow-up telephone call would be made about two weeks after the reception of the instrument in October 1983. At the time of the phone call, if the deans preferred, the answers could be given orally to the interviewer. However, all respondents chose to complete the questionnaire. In addition, an interview was set up so that any other problems or concerns about the part-time programs could be aired. If the deans chose, the phone call could be routed to the person in charge of the part-time program. The dean at Houston, Dan Jennings, was the only dean to respond personally to the questionnaire and the phone call. The assistant dean of the Worden school who is in charge of the part-time program, and the associate dean at the University of Texas at Arlington responded to the questionnaire and phone call. (In the case of the assistant dean at Worden, discussion took place in a face-to-face interview.) The person responsible for screening admissions at the graduate level at the University of Texas at Austin responded to the questionnaire and also took part in a face-to-face interview. In addition, the associate dean at the University of Texas at Austin also responded to questions dealing with his perception of the part-time program.

SURVEY RESULTS

All four graduate schools offer at least one type of part-time program, according to the criteria identified by Leuenberger. Only one school, the University of Houston, has only the part-time on campus model. Dean Dan Jennings stated that the criteria

for admissions, course requirements, faculty, advising, sequencing, and field practicum are identical with the full-time master's program. He also stated that students in the full-time program were free to convert to the part-time program and vice versa. He observed a good integration of students in the part-time program with the full-time program students, probably as a result of shared classes and shared facilities. Dean Jennings, in common with the other Texas graduate school deans or their representatives, was very pleased with the maturity, scholarship, and motivation of the part-time students, as well as the dimension of richness added to the classroom as a result of these students' experience and maturity.

The University of Texas at Austin (UT), and University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), and the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake University (OLLU) all have satellite model programs. The satellite program at UT is based in El Paso, and is in the second year of its first cohort of students. OLLU has sponsored satellite programs at El Paso, Abilene, and Midland, and is currently sponsoring a second cohort of students at Midland. UTA formerly presented programs in Canyon, Nacogdoches, and Dallas, and is presently offering satellite programs in both Lubbock and Commerce.

Both UT and UTA utilize other colleges or universities as their off-campus instructional sites, and OLLU utilizes trainning facilities. The number of students admitted each year ranges from a low of approximately 15 students (OLLU) to a high of approximately 30 students at UT's off site program. Both OLLU and UTA have a specific administrator who is responsible for the

alternative MSW program on a part-time basis and in addition to other duties.

All three schools have the same admissions criteria for both programs. However, both OLLU and UTA require a period of residence on the main campus which ranges from 15 weeks at OLLU to 32 weeks for UTA students. The UT program is completely off site, with no Austin residence requirement. However, faculty involved in the three alternative MSW programs did show some variation. See Table I below.

TABLE I

Faculty Rank of Faculty Involved in Off Site Part-Time MSW Programs

	UT	UTA	OLLU
Full Professor	1	2	3
Assoc. Profession	4	2	1
Asst. Professor			1
Instructor			
Lecturer	1		
Training Specialist	1		
Adjunct Assistant Professor	1		

UT showed the widest variety of faculty members by rank teaching in the program, and the fewest full professors. However, half their faculty in the alternative MSW program are associate professors. UTA had four faculty members assigned to the alternative MSW program, which was the fewest number of faculty committed to the off-site program; however, two are full professors and the other two are associate professors. OLLU has three full professors teaching in the alternative MSW program, one associate professor, and one assistant professor. Although superficially, there seems to be quite a bit of variety, all three schools heavily commit senior faculty to the program. In addition, only UTA

states that the number of course offerings in the alternative MSW program is fewer than those available to students in the regular on-campus MSW program.

Academic advising for these students is provided in both the UT and the UTA programs by both off campus and on campus faculty advisors, where as in the OLLU program it is provided by the program director, who is also the assistant dean of the school. In terms of perception of the adequacy of instructional materials, library resources, and academic advising, there is considerable variation between the schools. UT views all three areas as in need of improvement, UTA views all three areas as adequate, while OLLU considers the academic advising and the availability of instructional materials as more than adequate, and library resources as adequate. This differential in resource adequacy perception may be a function of the length of time the programs have been in operation however.

Course sequencing does vary at all three schools between the full-time MSW and the part-time MSW programs. However, in all the programs, students must complete the basic, foundation level courses before moving into the advanced courses. UT offers only its interpersonal helping sequence off site, although the addition of the administration/planning sequence is under discussion. At both UTA and at OLLU, students complete basic foundation courses off site, and then come to the main campus for advanced courses. UT's model differs substantially from this model, since no course work must be taken at the Austin campus, and a complete program is brought to the El Paso satellite location.

The table below (Table II) shows the variation in course sequencing among the schools.

TABLE II

MSW Course Sequencing by Semester and by Program

University of Texas-Austin	Full Time	Part Time
Basic Dynam. of Behavior	Sem. I	Sem. I
Basic Dynam. of Behavior (organ. & Comm.)	Sem. I	Sem. II
Soc. Prob. and Soc. Wel. Policy	Sem. I	Sem. I
Field Ins. I	Sem. I	Summer I (bwn. Sem. II & III)
Research Methods	Sem. II	Sem. II
Field Inst.	Sem. II	Sem. III
Interp. Help. Methods	Sem. II	Sem. III
Res.- Sp. Top.	Sem. III	Summer II (post Sem. IV)
Prob. & Policy II	Sem. III	Sem. IV
Adv. Inter. Per. Methods	Sem. III	Summer II
Sem. in Interp. Help.	Sem. III	Summer II
Admin. Processes in Inter. Prac.	Sem. III	Sem. IV
Field Ins. II (2 courses)	Sem. IV	Sem. V
Sem. in Inter. Help.	Sem. IV	Sem. V
University of Texas - Arlington		
Admin	Sem. I	Sem. III
Policy	Sem. I	Sem. I
HBSE	Sem. I	Sem. I
Dir. Prac.	Sem. I	Sem. III
Research	Sem. I	Sem. II
HBSE	Sem. II	Sem. II
Research	Sem. II	Sem. IV
Field	Sem. II	Summer (post sem. II)
Racism	Sem. II	Sem. IV
At this point, the remainder of the course work must be completed in compliance with University residence requirements; the two programs merge		
Our Lady of the Lake University- Worden School		
HBSE	Sem. I	Sem. I
Policy	Sem. I	Sem. I
Practice I	Sem. I	Sem. II
Research	Sem. I	Summer (post Sem. II)
Administration	Sem. I	Sem. I
At this point, the remainder of the required course work must be completed in compliance with University residence requirements. This students are free, as are all students, to do their block field off-site, and to take two electives concurrently with the field (1000 hours yielding 14 semester hours credit)		

The field placement varies among the three programs, and follows the model of the regular on-site MSW program. OLLU utilizes the block model while UT and UTA utilize both block and concurrent field placement models in their alternative MSW programs. The schools also follow the same policy with the alternative MSW programs in terms of field placement in an agency where the student has been previously employed or is presently employed as they do with their regular on campus MSW program. OLLU allows placement in agency of employment for both groups; UTA generally does not for both groups; and UT allows one of the two placements in an employing or prior employing agency for both groups.

All three schools utilize the same methods to identify and specify the learning goals and objectives of the alternative MSW students in their field placements as are used in the regular MSW program. OLLU and UTA utilize individual written learning contracts developed by the school, the agency, and the student, while UT sets the goals and objectives in all placements and utilizes individual learning contracts as well.

Field placements in both programs are monitored in both programs by a combination of telephone visits, mail, and field visits by faculty, with written feedback to the director of practicum. UTA evaluates field placements in both programs through at least two field visits per semester with written comment submitted to the Director of Field Instruction. Students at UT are monitored through attendance at field seminars while their alternative MSW program is monitored by three instructors who serve as faculty liasions responsible for holding three

on site evaluation conferences for each of two semesters. This serves the same purpose as the field seminars in the regular on site MSW program.

Although students in the alternative MSW program at OLLU are required to participate in on campus classes, however at neither UTA nor UT are they required to do so. Neither UTA nor OLLU specifically plan any activities besides classes for the alternative MSW students, while UT offers orientation, advisory board meetings and lectures by visiting professors for its alternative MSW program students. UT may feel that the geographic distance from Austin of its El Paso satellite program and the fact that alternative program MSW students do not attend classes on the main campus at any time makes it necessary to enrich the educational opportunities for these students.

All three schools utilize the same grading system to evaluate students in both programs and have formal policies requiring evaluation of classroom teaching in which the same evaluation procedure, formal student evaluation is utilized in both programs. In addition, UTA also utilizes a review within sequence. All three schools consider their full time/ tenure track faculty very supportive of the alternative MSW program.

SUMMARY

All four Texas graduate schools of social work have at least one type of part-time program as identified by Leuenberger's criteria. However, the University of Houston has only the part-time on campus model which is virtually indistinguishable from the full time MSW program. In the other three schools, all of which have a part time satellite model program, admissions

criteria, course requirements, sequencing, faculty, advising, and field practicum are conducted in a fashion nearly identical to the regular on campus MSW program. Those interviewed believe that students attending the satellite programs can be assured of an education virtually identical with the one at the regular site, and employers can be assured that the quality of education received is similar to that of the regular MSW program.

REFERENCES

Boynton, G. W. (ed.) (1981) Moving Ahead in the 80s: Issues for Part-Time Social Work Education. Proceedings of the First Annual Part-time Social Work Education Colloquium. West Virginia College of Graduate Studies Foundation.

Boynton, G. W. Summary of Issues and Recommendation for Action Plans. In Boynton (ed.) (1981). Moving Ahead in the 80s, 59-63.

Bragg, J.J. Problems of Part-Time Students. In Boynton (ed.) (1981). Moving Ahead in the 80s, 7-10.

The Carneige Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education: A Summary of Reports and Recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1980.

Caro, R. (1983). The Year of Lyndon Johnson: The Path to Power. New York: Vintage Books.

Cross, K. P. et al. (1974). Planning Non-Traditional Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elias, J. L. & Merriam, S. (1980). Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education. Malabar, Florida: Krieger.

Leutnberger, P. et al. (1983) Quality of Alternative or Part-Time Social Work Education Programs: Myths and Realities. Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 2, (no. 2), 11-15.

Mayhew, L. B. (1977). Legacy of the Seventies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meier, E. G. (1954). A History of the New York School of Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press.

Taylor, G. (1936). Chicago Commons Through Forty Years. Chicago.

Vermilye, D. W. (1975). Learner-Centered Reform. San Francisco Jossey-Bass.

Veysey, L. (1965). The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ID _____ 1-3

CARD _____ 4

An alternative MSW degree program is defined as one in which all or part of the curriculum is offered to a specifically designated group of students (e.g., individuals with baccalaureate degrees employed in human services, etc.) who are essentially separated at least for part of their studies, from other students in the regular full-time on-campus program. For the purpose of this study, alternative programs <u>are not</u> those where part-time students enroll in the regular on-campus program and take courses over an extended period of time.

Q1. According to the preceding definition, does your school offer an alternative education program leading to the Master of Social Work degree?

1. ____ Yes (Skip to Q3)
2. ____ No (Go to Q2) 5

Q2. Do you plan to implement an alternative MSW program within the next two years?

1. ____ Yes (Go to Q2a)
2. ____ No Thank you. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope. 6

Q2a. Excluding the field work component, will students in your alternative MSW program enroll

1. ____ Part-time
2. ____ Full-time
3. ____ Full and Part-time Combination 7
4. ____ Don't know

Q2b. Excluding the field work component, will instruction in your alternative MSW program be provided

1. ____ On-campus
2. ____ Off-campus
3. ____ Both on and off-campus
4. ____ Don't know

8

Q2c. Excluding the field work component, where will the courses be taught in your alternative MSW program? (Circle all that apply)

1. ____ Regular on-campus facilities 9
2. ____ Off-campus learning centers (defined as sites designated by the school that provide classroom space as well as other basic services - e.g. admissions, advising, etc. - and are administratively accountable to the on-campus school of social work.) 10
3. ____ Other universities/colleges 11
4. ____ Community colleges/junior colleges 12
5. ____ High schools, social agencies, or other community facilities 13
6. ____ Other 14
7. ____ Don't know 15

Q2d. Will the field work component in your alternative MSW program require a

1. ____ Block placement 16
2. ____ Concurrent placement
3. ____ Either block or concurrent placement
4. ____ Other. Please specify _____
   _____
5. ____ Don't know

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION. PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED STAMPED-SELF ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.

Q3. How long has your alternative MSW program been in operation? 17 - 18

_____ years

Q4. Excluding the field work component, are students enrolled in your alternative MSW program

1. ____ Part-time 19
2. ____ Full-time
3. ____ Other: please specify
   _____
   _____

Q5. Excluding the field work component, what kinds of teaching facilities are used in your alternative MSW program? (Check all that apply.)

1. ____ Regular on-campus university facilities 20
2. ____ Off-campus learning centers (defined as sites designated by the school that provide classroom space as well as other basic services, e.g. admission, advising, etc. and are administratively accountable to the on-campus school of social work.) 21
3. ____ Other universities/colleges 22
4. ____ Community college/junior college 23
5. ____ High schools, social agencies, other community facilities 24
6. ____ Other: please specify 25
   _____
   _____

Q6. On the average, how many students are admitted each year to your alternative MSW education program?

Approximately _____ students 26 - 28

Q7. Do you have a specific person administratively responsible for your alternative MSW program?

1. ____ Yes (Go to Q7a and 7b) 29

2. ____ No (Skip to Q8)

Q7a. (Please indicate the persons' title)

Title: _____(Go to Q7b)

Q7b. Is the position full or part-time?

1. ____ Full-time 30

2. ____ Part-time

Q8. Please indicate which of the following criteria you use in admitting students to your regular on-campus and alternative MSW program. (Check all that apply)

CRITERIA Do you use?	REGULAR MSW PROGRAM		ALTERNATIVE MSW PROGRAM	
Undergraduate grade point average	Yes	No 31	Yes	No 38
Miller Analogies Test	Yes	No 32	Yes	No 39
Graduate Record Exam	Yes	No 33	Yes	No 40
Faculty Interviews	Yes	No 34	Yes	No 41
Reference Letters	Yes	No 35	Yes	No 42
Employment Experience in Social Agencies	Yes	No 36	Yes	No 43
Other: Please Specify _____	Yes	No 37	Yes	No 44

Q9. After the first registration in your alternative MSW program, within how many years must a student complete all degree requirements?

_____ years 45

Q10. Does your alternative MSW program require students to be in residence on the main campus at anytime during the program?

1. ____ Yes (Go to Q10a) 46

2. ____ No (Skip to Q11)

Q10a. How many weeks residence are required?

_____ weeks 47 - 48

Q11. Excluding field work instructors how many persons in the following categories are currently employed by your school to teach courses in the regular MSW Program. (Please indicate whether the person is full or part-time)

	Full Time Indicate Number	Part Time Indicate Number
Full Professors	_____ 49 - 50	_____ 51 - 52 53 - 54
Associate Professors	_____ 55 - 56	_____ 57 - 58 59 - 60
Assistant Professors	_____ 61 - 62	_____ 63 - 64 65 - 66
Instructors	_____ 67 - 68	_____ 69 - 70 71 - 72
Lecturers	_____ 73 - 74	_____ 75 - 76 77 - 78 1 - 3 4
PhD/DSW Students	_____ 5 - 6	_____ 7 - 8 9 - 10
Community Professionals	_____ 11 - 12	_____ 13 - 14 15 - 16
Faculty from Other Universities/Colleges	_____ 17 - 18	_____ 19 - 20 21 - 22
Other: Please Indicate Title: _____ _____	_____ 23 - 24	_____ 25 - 26 27 - 28

Q12. How many persons in the following categories have taught or will teach one or more courses in your alternative MSW Program during the current 1982/83 academic year?

Full Professors	_____	29 - 30
Associate Professors	_____	31 - 32
Assistant Professors	_____	33 - 34
Instructors	_____	35 - 36
Lecturers	_____	37 - 38
PhD/DSW Students	_____	39 - 40
Community Professional	_____	41 - 42
Faculty from Other Universities/Colleges	_____	43 - 44
Other - Please Indicate	_____	45 - 46

Title: _____

_____

Q13. Is the number of courses that can be selected by students in the alternative MSW program 47

1) ____ More than those available to students in the regular on-campus MSW program

2) ____ About the same as those available to students in the regular on-campus MSW program

3) ____ Fewer than those available to students in the regular on-campus MSW program

Q14. Who provides academic advising to students enrolled in your alternative MSW program? 48

1. ____ On-campus faculty advisor(s)
2. ____ Off-campus faculty advisor(s)
3. ____ Both off and on-campus faculty
4. ____ Other: Please Specify

_____

_____

Q15. To what extent are the following resources adequate to meet the educational needs of the students enrolled in your alternative MSW program?

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Needs Improvement	
Library Resources				49
Academic Advising				50
Availability of Instructional Materials (Audio-Visual equipment, etc.)				51

Q16. What field work placement model is used in your regular on-campus MSW program? 52

1. ____ Block Placement
2. ____ Concurrent Placement
3. ____ Other: Please specify

_____

_____

Q17. What field work placement model is used in your alternative MSW program? 53

1. ____ Block Placement
2. ____ Concurrent Placement
3. ____ Other: Please specify

_____

_____

Q18. Are students in your regular on-campus MSW program permitted field placement in an agency where they are either presently or have been previously employed? 54

1. ____ Yes
2. ____ Generally not, but exceptions are made
3. ____ No

Q19. Are students in your alternative MSW program permitted field placement in an agency where they are either presently or have been previously employed? 55

1. ____ Yes
2. ____ Generally not, but exceptions are made
3. ____ No

Q20. What methods are used in your regular on-campus MSW program to identify and specify the learning goals and objectives of students in their field placements? 56

1. ____ Individual written learning contracts developed by the school, agency and student
2. ____ The school sets the goals and objectives in all placements
3. ____ Other: Please specify

_____

_____

Q21. Are the same methods used to identify and specify the learning goals and objectives of alternative MSW students in their field placement? 57

1. ____ Yes (Go to Q21a)
2. ____ No (Skip to Q22)

Q21a. Please indicate how the methods are different.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____